

REMARKS

PAGE 7

Serial No.: 10/017,653

Filing Date: 12/12/2001

Attorney Docket No. 100.407US02

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ELECTRONICALLY IDENTIFYING CONNECTIONS OF A CROSS-CONNECT SYSTEM

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on January 24, 2007 has been reviewed, along with the art cited. Claim 33 has been amended. Claims 14-45 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14-21, 23-28, and 33-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,510). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 14 of the present application recites, in relevant part, “a processor coupled to ***the first and second*** communication mediums, the processor coordinating the communication of the connection information signals via the second communication medium and acquisition of connection information with regard to the cross-connected termination elements.” (emphasis added).

With respect to claim 14, the Office Action took the position that processor 17 in Fig. 1A of Cohen discloses “a processor coupled to the first and second communication mediums.” The Office Action also took the position that “a jumper 8 in Fig. 4” teaches “a first communication medium communicatively coupling cross-connected termination elements of the plurality of termination elements.” However, nothing in Cohen teaches or suggests that processor 17 in Fig. 1A is coupled to the jumper 8. Moreover, nowhere does Cohen teach “the processor coordinating the communication of the connection information signals via the second communication medium” as recited in claim 14. Indeed, Cohen relates to a fundamentally different approach in which a hand-held optical scanner is used to scan barcodes and display that information for a user.

Since Cohen does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 14, claim 14 is not anticipated by Cohen. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 16-21 and 23-28 depend from claim 14 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 14. In addition, claim 17 recites, in relevant part, “at least one patch cord ***comprising a first*** communication pathway ***and a***

second communication pathway.” The Office Action took the position that “the medium for transmitting optically encoded data 13” teaches the second communication pathway and that the “jumper 8” teaches the first communication pathway. However, nothing in Cohen teaches that “one patch cord” comprises both the “jumper 8” and “the medium for transmitting optically encoded data 13.”

Furthermore, claim 17 recites “the second communication pathway providing communication of connection information signals *to and from the first and second termination elements*.” The Office Action states that the medium for transmitting optically encoded data connects “a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface 16 in Fig. 1A.” Nothing in Cohen teaches the medium for transmitting optically encoded data communicates “connection information signals to and from the first and second termination elements.”

For the reasons stated above, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 16-21 and 23-38 be withdrawn.

In order to expedite prosecution, claim 33 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, “communicating, via a second communication medium separate from the first communication medium, connection information signals *between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system*.” The medium connecting a hand-held optical scanner and a receiver interface, as discussed in Cohen, does not teach or suggest communicating “between the cross-connected termination elements of the cross-connect system.” Therefore, Cohen does not teach all the claimed features of amended claim 33, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 34-42 depend from claim 33 and, thus, are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with regards to claim 33. Applicant, therefore, requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22, 29-32, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,510). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

REMARKS**PAGE 9**

Serial No.: 10/017,653

Filing Date: 12/12/2001

Attorney Docket No. 100,407US02

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR ELECTRONICALLY IDENTIFYING CONNECTIONS OF A
CROSS-CONNECT SYSTEM

Claims 22 and 29-32 depend from claim 14 and, thus, at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 14 apply to these claims as well. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 43-45 depend from claim 33 and, thus at least the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 33 apply to these claims as well. Therefore, claims 43-45 are not obvious over Cohen. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14-45 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2007-04-24

/Jon M. Powers/
Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731